

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY
HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
RIVER AND PLATEAU COMMITTEE

February 12, 2013

Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Opening.....	1
Land Transition between Programs and Contractors	1
Committee Business (Part 1).....	5
Issue Manager Report-Out on Tank Closure and Waste Management Final Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM FEIS) Groundwater and Vadose Zone Modeling (JOINT WITH TWC).....	6
Update on the River Corridor Cleanup Work	8
Committee Business (Part 2).....	11
Attachments	12
Attendees	12

<p>This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not fully represent the ideas discussed or opinions given. Examination of this document cannot equal or replace attendance and public participation.</p>
--

Opening*

Pam Larsen, River and Plateau Committee (RAP) Chair, welcomed the committee and introductions were made. Due to the many changes received on the January committee meeting summary, the committee will review a revised version and consider approval at the RAP meeting in March.

Larry Gadbois, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), circulated a calendar produced by the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation as a good example of public information distribution.

Land Transition between Programs and Contractors

Agency Presentation

Keith Grindstaff, U.S. Department of Energy – Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), long-term stewardship (LTS) manager and team lead for stewardship management provided a presentation on LTS while referencing the LTS website (www.hanford.gov/page.cfm/LongTermStewardship). Keith provided background information on the LTS program, reviewed the LTS Transition Map and Timeline, and

* Please see Attachment 1 – Transcribed Flip Chart Notes for key points/follow up actions recorded during the committee discussion.

provided an overview of transition and execution activities. Keith emphasized the following points as he gave his presentation:

- The LTS program focuses on communication and transparency to keep members of the public informed.
- Original workshops with the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) and the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) took place in 2001 to determine the purpose of the LTS program. LTS officially became a program in 2010 with the issuance of Revision 0 of the *Hanford Long-Term Stewardship Program Plan*.
- The Hanford Long-Term Stewardship Fact Sheet: What is Long-Term Stewardship (Attachment 2) explains, “LTS refers to all activities necessary to ensure protection of human health and the environment following completion of cleanup, disposal or stabilization of a site.” The DOE LTS program continues to conduct all necessary surveillance and monitoring.
- Records Management is one of the biggest projects under LTS. Documents are compiled in what is called a transition and turnover documentation package developed prior to the transition of land from the cleanup contractor to LTS.
- The Transition Map (www.hanford.gov/page.cfm/LTSTransition) shows the River Corridor broken into segments. There is no significance to the colors assigned to the different segments. LTS refers to segments in terms of geographic area.
- The Central Plateau is not part of the LTS program at this time.
- The difference between land transition and land conveyance is explained in the Hanford Long-Term Stewardship Fact Sheet: Transition vs. Transfer (Attachment 3). Land conveyance is “an assignment of property from one party to another,” and land transition “involves shifting land management responsibility between DOE programs – from a cleanup program to the long-term stewardship (LTS) program once remedial objectives have been achieved.” DOE retains ownership while land is under LTS. When land is moved away from LTS into U.S. Department of Energy - Legacy Management (DOE-LM), DOE retains ownership, as both programs are under DOE. There are provisions for how property is transferred. There is a five-year window beginning in 2055 for LTS to work with LM. A transfer to LM typically takes about three years, but LTS has planned for five years in the budget profile due to the size of the site.
- Land transition to LTS can occur without a final Record of Decision (ROD). The River Corridor contractor, Washington Closure Hanford (WCH), has a closure contract. WCH is finishing active cleanup work per the interim ROD and is scheduled to finish work before the final RODs. If there is additional work to be done for those RODs, LTS will oversee that the work gets done.
- As of April 2012, the *Hanford Long-Term Stewardship Program Plan* was revised. As a part of the transition process, program managers reviewed the documentation checklist to ensure a segment of land is ready to be transitioned. The checklist includes a punch list of actions that still need to be completed before the land can be turned over. For each of these segments, there will be a final ROD. If a new waste site is discovered or additional cleanup is required after the land is transitioned, DOE will go through the same punch list process. Newly identified waste sites are added in the Waste Information Data System (WIDS) and added to the punch list.
- Segments in the River Corridor are scheduled for transition to LTS. Segment 1 was transitioned in 2011. Segments 2 and 3 were transitioned in 2012. The reactor and Reactor Area F are planned for transition in 2013.

- Continued lessons learned and process improvement components take place as part of extensive ongoing LTS program improvement efforts.

Keith noted that he would be happy to come back to speak with the committee and encouraged committee members to visit the LTS website. Keith provided business cards with his contact information and the LTS website address.

Committee Questions and Response

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments. Questions, comments, and responses were provided by HAB members unless noted otherwise.

Q. LM is very underfunded. How does LM manage funding issues as the program grows?

R. [DOE] LM has its own funding. LM's mission is to take ownership of cleanup sites once cleanup is completed. When LM first takes on a site, LM submits a budget request to Congress to fund the site's program. LM recognizes there are budget issues and will be as efficient as possible.

Q. What is the difference in responsibilities under LTS and LM?

R. [DOE] DOE is working to align LTS requirements as closely as possible to LM requirements. LTS is working with LM so that transition and turnover documentation will be prepared and ready to submit to LM as scheduled in 2060. Hanford Site is a large site, and LM is not used to dealing with sites of this size and with so many records.

C. Land will be considered part of the LTS program while Pump and Treat cleanup is still underway. This cleanup work will be done as part of the Plateau Remediation Contract (PRC). It would be incorrect to consider land where groundwater is being pumped and treated cleaned up.

Q. What does the term conveyance mean?

R. [DOE] Conveyance is a legal term that refers to different rights to the land. Transfer is one example of conveyance. A conveyance would also include a temporary lease, easement, or permit. LTS is not in the conveyance or transfer business. LTS is working on transition of management of areas to the LTS program to be managed by the Mission Support Contractor (MSC), Mission Support Alliance (MSA).

C. LM is a program within DOE that is different from the U.S. Department of Energy – Environmental Management Program (DOE-EM). Once all the land is cleaned up and goes to the LTS program, it will eventually be transferred to LM. Once LM assumes responsibility for the land, DOE-RL is no longer responsible for it. It is the DOE Environmental Management Program's (EM) responsibility to obtain the necessary budget.

R. [DOE] The land could transfer to a different government agency. It does not have to go through LM to pass to another agency.

C. The Secretary of Energy has to go to Congress and ask for funding.

Q. Under LTS, how is a new waste site identified if waste migrates into the site?

R. [DOE] Any waste sites that require monitoring will continue to be monitored under LTS. If the contractor responsible for LTS discovers a new waste site, that contractor is responsible for fencing it off and documenting it. Today, MSA is responsible for managing those segments and acts as a management component to help manage the property. If additional cleanup work is needed, DOE would hire a cleanup contractor to do that work.

C. There is an assumption that once land has gone through remediation, all of the cleanup issues have been identified. Once remediation is complete, it is unlikely that continued monitoring would uncover new issues. Continued monitoring is not an active process of looking for contamination. The assumption is that remediated land in LTS is clean and that is why it is in LTS.

R. [DOE] There is a process for orphan waste site work. Prior to land transition to LTS, a team of WCH, MSA, and DOE representatives conduct a site walk-down to inventory site conditions prior to transition. A Segment 1 walk-down resulted in identification of a waste site that had not previously been identified. The site was documented, added to the punch list, and DOE determined who would be responsible for cleanup. The punch list process has been successful.

Q. What are the responsibilities associated with F reactor?

R. [DOE] F reactor has a 75-year life, and the decision for what to do with it has not yet been made. F reactor is currently cocooned and undergoes an annual walk-around and a 5-year check.

Q. The land transition process is moving too quickly. What will happen if there is a ROD challenge?

R. [DOE] The LTS program is working well. WCH contract work is done to the interim RODs, and WCH has completed what they are responsible for under their contract. The LTS program is in place to manage the institutional controls and any ongoing surveillance and monitoring.

Q. Does LTS have funding for additional excavation and removal?

R. [DOE] When the final RODs are in place, LTS management will consider necessary funding. If the interim ROD cleanup standards are found not to be sufficient and additional cleanup is needed, DOE would hire a contractor to do the cleanup work and another transition turnover package and punch list would need to be developed.

C. It makes more sense to hold off on the land transition until the final ROD is in place and the cleanup is completed.

Q. Will pieces of F Area be transitioned back to DOE-RL for additional cleanup?

R. [DOE]. The land would remain under the management of the MSC and a cleanup contractor (e.g. CHPRC) could be brought on for the work if it makes sense with their contract. When final RODs are in place, DOE will need to make these decisions.

Q. Will reactors be dismantled in the future? How is LTS planning to keep up awareness and a sense of urgency for far-distant major cleanup actions? It is important to maintain public awareness of major outstanding cleanup actions.

R. [DOE] It is not currently in DOE's baseline to dismantle reactors. DOE would need Congressional funding to do so. As of right now, there is no final decision for how they will be dealt with.

C. There was a past announcement that cleanup at 100 F was completed. This is not true, as there is a uranium plume beneath the reactor where the pool leaked in front of the reactor. There is also a strontium and nitrate plume. According to the proposed alternative in the RI/FS Proposed Plan, the plan is to take a Monitored Natural Attenuation (MNA) approach to cleanup rather than using Pump and Treat. This means that rather than moving the reactor to remediate contamination, the plan is to let the contamination sit and decay. Comments from the Oregon Department of Energy may be appropriate on this topic.

R. [DOE] Once the reactor is transitioned to LTS, it will be monitored and that does not mean that DOE will not have follow up actions. WCH is coming to the end of its contract.. LTS is keeping the site in safe conditions, and there could be follow-up work with a final ROD.

C. If there is no remediation in place in the final ROD, then no one is responsible for additional cleanup.

Q. Where is the opportunity for public comment, and at what point does the HAB have a chance to weigh in?

R. [DOE] The HAB could talk to J.D. Dowell, DOE-RL Assistant Manager, and the regulators.

C. [EPA] EPA has no role in the transition process. If lands are transitioned out of DOE or if they are leased, EPA is involved to determine if it is safe for the land to be leased, but DOE is the land manager and can determine how the lease takes place.

R. [DOE] DOE subject matter experts (SME) are reviewing the F reactor area transition package documentation. These are part of the checklist requirements in the back of the Program Plan. DOE will provide comments back to MSA before the final package is sent out (April-May timeframe).

Q. What is the rush to transition the land to LTS before the final ROD?

R. [DOE] The WCH contract only requires cleanup to interim ROD standards. DOE does not want the contractor to walk away and leave cleanup gaps. If the final ROD is in place and WCH is still working, DOE may choose to engage WCH by extending their contract if there is more work to be done.

C. It would be helpful to have an organizational chart to show the relationship between responsible parties involved in land transitions.

The committee agreed that they would like to hear an update on land transition of F Reactor. Topics of interest for the update include documentation of the area, punch list items, checklist items reviewed by SME and SME evaluation, a description of the walk-down, and how transition occurs between contractors. A discussion of final ROD development for F Area would be the second part of this discussion. The committee agreed that this topic is timely for April. Issue managers are Bob Suyama, Jean Vanni and Dan Serres.

Committee Business (Part 1)

Status review of HAB 2013 Program of Work/Priorities

The committee reviewed an excerpted version specific to RAP of the HAB 2013 Program of Work/Priorities as part of a mid-year review/status update. Hillary Johnson, EnviroIssues, suggested using the following terms to define status in the 6-Month Status column: IM, Committee, Advice, Deferred, No Action). The committee clarified that the term Committee would indicate the topic is planned and coming to the committee. The committee populated the 6-Month Status column.

John Howieson noted that it would be useful on future charts to include issue manager (IM) initials. Hillary noted that she would add IM initials for each topic and it will later be distributed to the committee for review.

Issue Manager Report-Out on Tank Closure and Waste Management Final Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM FEIS) Groundwater and Vadose Zone Modeling (JOINT WITH TWC)

Dale Engstrom introduced the topic of Tank Closure and Waste Management Final Environmental Impact Statement (TC & WM FEIS) Groundwater and Vadose Zone Modeling. Dale is an issue manager on this topic and noted that the purpose of discussing this topic at this meeting was to develop questions to help frame up a future agenda item on groundwater modeling in the EIS. The EIS has been finalized and signed, and the committee would now like the opportunity to discuss how certain decisions were made. Groundwater modeling has been raised as an issue of concern. Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC) was hired as an independent entity to conduct this modeling effort with the intent that using an independent group would make the modeling more defensible.

As issue manager, Dale had worked with DOE and compiled a set of questions proposed for a future EIS groundwater topic:

- What groundwater and vadose zone model codes were used in the EIS, what were these codes used for, and why? Why was particle tracking selected to simulate plume development?
- How was the draft version modeling different from the modeling used in the TC&WM FEIS? Why do many of the figures (showing plumes and break-through curves for each contaminant) look different from draft to final?
- How did the Technical Guidance document and consent settlement agreement constrain the TC&WM FEIS model?
- How was the TC & WM FEIS groundwater model calibrated?
- What were the Sensitivity Analyses and why were they done? How did they reduce the uncertainty in the model?
- What would the committee like to learn from the agencies at a future committee meeting?

Committee Questions and Discussion

Several more framing questions for a more general groundwater discussion were proposed. These questions are captured in the flipchart notes (see attached).

C. [DOE] Mary Beth Burandt, U.S. Department of Energy – Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP) EIS Document Manager, noted that based on quality assurance (QA) issues found in the Hanford Site Solid (Radioactive and Hazardous) Waste Program EIS, DOE was required to conduct modeling using a commercially available model. Until this point, not all of the models used were commercially available. Under the terms of the Settlement Agreement, the model had to be independently verified and the results able to be replicated.

C. This issue is viewed politically. Some people within DOE-RL have stated they have nothing to do with EIS modeling (the RL groundwater model was not used) and do not want to talk about it. Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) did not do the modeling.

Q. SAIC developed the model, and now their contract is done. What happens to the model now?

R. [DOE] The understanding was that once the FEIS was issued, the model would get turned over to DOE-RL to maintain configuration control and quality assurance (QA). If any changes were to be made to it, those changes would be documented.

C. [DOE] Mary Beth asked the committee to consider the policy issue of concern related to the EIS and what the committee is looking to glean from a groundwater modeling discussion. Mary Beth noted that five HAB issue managers attended the groundwater modeling technical review meetings and workshops on calibration throughout 2006 and 2007 as the model was being developed. The goal was to get everyone's questions and concerns expressed and incorporated for consideration during development. After the workshops, the issue managers said they were finished and did not want to hear any more. No additional issues were identified. There was no advice issued on groundwater modeling. It is unclear to DOE what the committee is looking to achieve by reviewing the groundwater model in the EIS.

C. The committee is interested in understanding how the EIS model will be used to guide future decisions. The committee frequently discusses modeling.

C. The HAB wants a better understanding of modeling so that advice on cleanup levels makes sense.

C. Modeling will always be an issue. It seems that the committee is at the point to accept it even if the committee does not like or understand it.

C. There are a lot of new people on the Board that have questions about the groundwater model requiring clarification.

Committee members agreed to look into whom the five issue managers were who participated in the technical review meetings and workshops to answer technical questions about the model.

Pam suggested that those who are interested in detailed questions can work with the issue managers to gain and understanding and further clarification.

The committee agreed that further issue manager work was needed and this topic was not ready for the March meeting. Dale and Shelley Cimon will work on this with DOE. Dale will create a synopsis of what the issue managers learned during the EIS process and send it out to the committee.

Update on the River Corridor Cleanup Work

Agency Presentation

Mark French, DOE-RL, and Carol Johnson, WCH President, provided a presentation to update the committee on the River Corridor cleanup work (Attachment 5). The presentation included information on the WCH work scope; work scope and closure contract progress; progress at the 300 Area, 618-10 Burial Ground, F Reactor, D/H Reactor, N Reactor Area, B/C waste sites, 100-C-7, and Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF); and WCH completion goals. Prior to their presentation, Mark and Carol provided a high-level overview of the contract. The presenters emphasized the following points as they gave their presentation:

- WCH is about 7.5 years into the contract, which began in 2005. The original contract was valued at \$1.8 billion, and the current contract is valued at \$2.4 billion due to the large amount of work that has been added.
- DOE conducted a Safety Culture survey in summer 2012 for Hanford Site. There was 75% participation by WCH employees in the survey, which is successful participation for that type of survey.
- In February 2012, WCH achieved 6 million man-hours without a lost workday case. Since then, there has been a truck roll over on site and a hernia incident that resulted in a lost workday.
- WCH will be roughly 90% complete on the contract scope at the end of 2013. WCH has begun an aggressive employee placement program of taking employees off Hanford Site projects to work on other projects. WCH believes it is important that workers feel people are taking care of them and their future employment. So far WCH has placed 87% of people who have left the project. This translates to 58 people being placed out of 65 people leaving the project to date. These are non-bargaining employees.
- The 382 Processing Area Tanks were taken down at the end of 2012. The next step is to take down the 340 Vault. This was where the waste from the 300 Areas was sent. When the vaults were full, waste was transferred by rail to CWC or to the tank farms.
- 326 Building is likely the next building to be demolished. It was fireproofed very well, which means there is a lot of asbestos in the walls, making it a challenge for demolition. Typically when demolishing buildings the dig and haul procedure goes down three feet below grade (slab). If a building has a basement and the basement floor is clean, the slab of concrete can be left. If not, the slab plus soil three feet below the slab must be removed.
- The 618-10 burial ground is one of the last burial grounds WCH is remediating. 618-10 waste trench remediation stopped in December due to nondestructive analysis (NDA) data issues. WCH stopped remediation efforts and brought in an independent group to see if the modeling was correct. WCH hopes to resume remediation efforts for 618-10 in March. One of the drums that had been sent to and buried in ERDF is suspected to be transuranic (TRU). WCH stopped disposing of other waste in that area. Approximately 100 drums have been remediated to date. Of these, one is potentially TRU. Plans are being made to dig up that drum.
- Many cultural resources sites are located in N Reactor Area. There is a deep petroleum plume around the reactor. WCH discovered other unexpected shallow petroleum sites. In the 1980s a number of spills took place totaling about 500,000 gallons of waste. WCH is putting together a

plan for how to remediate the contaminated soil. There will also be issues of structural integrity of the reactor. This much contamination close to the reactor was unanticipated.

- WCH excavated about 1.2 million bank cubic meters (BCM) from 100-C-7:1. 2 Million tons went to ERDF. 62,000 tons required treatment at ERDF. The last area remediated was the sidewall contamination. WCH removed the clean soils and used the clean soils to backfill in the C-7 hole itself. Backfilling was completed; will do some mounding to contour the land. ERDF is expected to process 300,000 tons of waste next quarter, amounting to about 250-300 containers of waste each day.

Regulators Perspective

Kim Welsch, Ecology, noted that DOE's schedule shows a ROD for D/H Area anticipated by the end of 2013. The 100-N RI/FS draft will go to Ecology for review in April. The ROD is projected for June 2014. Kim noted that he is also the document lead for Orchard Lands Operable Unit. The initial work plan will go to Ecology by the end of April 2013.

Committee Questions and Response

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments. Questions, comments, and responses were provided by HAB members unless noted otherwise.

Q. Will the Machine Shop remain on site?

R. [DOE] No. There were beryllium concerns with that building. No big shops will remain.

R. [EPA] WCH thought a couple of the buildings on site were attractive for future use and sought industry tenants. No one wanted to buy the building for \$1, so they will be taken down.

Q. Is there a sense of what percentage of the work is not going to get done, and what are the waste sites that will remain? There are areas that are not covered under the WCH contract.

R. [WCH] Work that has not been planned for will not be completed. All of the high-hazard, highly contaminated facilities with the exception of 324 building will be remediated.

R. [DOE] The backfilled area is where all of the waste sites have been completed.

R. [EPA] Between the 324 and 325 buildings there is a pipeline that transferred spent slurries. There is a labyrinth of contaminated pipelines that carried waste and have leaked.

Q. There has been talk of contamination underneath the parking lot adjacent to the badging building. Will this be remediated?

R. [DOE] WCH sampled the parking lot where historical records showed spills and no contamination was found.

Q. Has anything very unexpected been discovered?

R. [DOE] The number of bottles found in the burial ground was surprising.

Q. Were any uranium shavings found?

R. [DOE] Depleted uranium was found. It looked like a small container packed in dunnage inside, which was unexpected.

Q. How did concern emerge that there might be TRU waste at ERDF through a modeling process?

R. [DOE] A problem with the modeling was identified, which led to a reexamination of the drums that have been processed there. This led to the question of whether anything had been stored at ERDF that should not be. Each one of the counters is set up for the matrix of the waste at ERDF. The matrix needs to be recalibrated if waste is discovered in a different form in a drum, e.g. sludge instead of debris.

R. [WCH] This system is applicable only to the concrete drums. Drums are determined to be concrete based on their weight. WCH relies on a model and a set of assumptions to analyze the kinds of gamma and spectroscopy data present. The data received through the process did not align with the model WCH had been using, which resulted in questions about the gamma's speck, the significance of the peaks, the concrete and contaminated soil from the overpacking process.

Q. What were the contaminants of concern associated with the 500,000-gallon spill between N Reactor Area and the river?

R. [DOE] Mostly radioactive cesium and strontium. Some of the waste came out of the fuel basin storage system. One incident was associated with a hose leak. More information about this is available in WIDS.

Q. Where does the K Area sludge problem fit into WCH cleanup?

R. [DOE] The K East storage basin has been removed, and the K East Reactor is in the process of being cocooned by the Plateau Remediation Company (PRC). Contaminated pipes were discovered in K West. There are plans for the K West Reactor to be cocooned after the sludge has been removed.

Q. If the work scope for the WCH contract goes through 2015, WCH still has two years on their contract. Why is there a rush to transition the land?

R. [DOE] This is a completion contract, which is different from contracts at PRC. When the contract was awarded, WCH was supposed to be finished by the end of 2014. It was not known that C-7 would need to be remediated when the contract was awarded. A lot of work was added to the contract. WCH is responsible for remediation, not surveillance and maintenance systems. DOE is transitioning the responsibility for those areas to MSA. DOE is still present on site, but it will be a different contractor to provide surveillance and maintenance for the long term.

Q. What is the regulatory pathway/definition to allow for-in trench treatment of waste (e.g. grout in ERDF)?

R. [EPA] There are extensive attorney discussions with EPA and DOE on this issue.

Q. Is there anything more in the closure contract for remediation of the zigzag trench (169N)?

R. [DOE] Remediation there is done, and there is nothing else needed from the closure contractor for that. It is unknown if more work will be required in the final ROD.

The committee agreed it will track and comment on components of the River Corridor primarily through RI/FSs and Proposed Plans.

Committee Business (Part 2)

Update the 3-Month Work Plan

Hillary noted that Doug Shoop, DOE-RL Deputy Manager, was unable to present at this meeting on the topic of the 2015 Vision and Beyond. Doug is available to speak with the committee on Wednesday, March 6, which is typically a Tank Waste Committee (TWC) meeting day. DOE requested that the committee try to accommodate Doug's schedule. Dirk Dunning noted that the Hanford Cleanup Board meets Monday, March 4 and Tuesday March 5. RAP committee members agreed that moving the March RAP meeting to Wednesday March 6 was workable pending Executive Issues Committee (EIC) approval of the schedule change.

The committee updated the RAP 3-Month Work Plan (Attachment 6). The committee agreed that in March they would like to receive an update on the 2015 Vision and Beyond and an update on Deep Vadose Zone Remediation Technologies. The committee would also like to schedule a half-day Hanford Site tour for March to see the 200 West Pump and Treat Facility and any other sites of interest DOE would be able to show. Kim Ballinger, DOE-RL, will look into the possibility of having a tour and will coordinate with the committee to schedule it.

The committee agreed the following topics were timely for April:

- 300 Area Proposed Plan and RI/FS
- Land transition at F Area
- ROD development for F Area
- Regulator briefing/update on their comments on the 100 F/IU Operable Unit Proposed Plan Draft A and the 100 D/H Operable Unit Proposed Plan Draft A
- TC & WM FEIS groundwater model (tentative).

The committee agreed that the following topics would likely be timely for May:

- The ASCEM 3 dimensional groundwater monitoring model (not time critical),
- Potential follow-up to the 300 Area and advice development
- U-Canyon update (tentative)
- Orchard Lands Operable Unit Work Plan

Dirk noted that DOE has begun discussions about waste under DOE Order 435.1. The committee agreed that this should be a joint topic with the Tank Waste Committee (TWC) on the TWC meeting agenda.

Complete the March Potential Meeting Topics Table

The committee completed the March Potential Meeting Topics Table and decided that the following framing questions were appropriate for the topic of Deep Vadose Zone Remediation Technologies:

- What technologies are being funded for additional development?

- What are the results of the recent testing of perched water, desiccation and technetium pumping?
- What lessons are being learned about deep vadose zone technology?

Dale Engstrom and Shelley Cimon are the issue managers on this topic.

Attachments

Attachment 1: Transcribed Flip Chart Notes

Attachment 2: Hanford Long-Term Stewardship Fact Sheet: What is Long-Term Stewardship (LTS)

Attachment 3: Hanford Long-Term Stewardship Fact Sheet: Transition vs. Transfer

Attachment 4: Hanford Advisory Board 2013 Program of Work/Priorities

Attachment 5: Briefing on the River Corridor Closure Project

Attachment 6: River and Plateau Committee – 3 Month Work Plan

Attendees

Board Members and Alternates

Richard Bloom	John Howieson	Dick Smith
Shelley Cimon	Pam Larsen	John Stanfill
Dirk Dunning	Liz Mattson	Richard Stout
Dale Engstrom	Maynard Plahuta	Bob Suyama
Harold Heacock	Daniel Serres	Jean Vanni

Others

Kim Ballinger, DOE-RL	Madeleine Brown, Ecology	Bruce Ford, CHPRC
Paula Call, DOE-RL (phone)	Kim Welsch, Ecology	Theresa Labriola, Columbia Riverkeeper
Mark French, DOE-RL	Larry Gadbois, EPA	Abby Chazanow, EnviroIssues
Keith Grindstaff, DOE-RL		Hillary Johnson, EnviroIssues
Boyd Hathaway, DOE-RL		Sharon Braswell, MSA
Mary Beth Burandt, DOE-ORP		David Brown, MSA
Tom Rogers, WA-DOH		Kelly Deatherage, MSA
		Rick Moren, MSA
		Reed Kaldor, MSA
		Barb Wise, MSA
		Peter Bengtson, WCH
		Carol Johnson, WCH
		Mark McKenna, WCH
		Roger Ovink, WCH

TC&WM FEIS groundwater modeling

- What codes, how/why? Rationale?
- How was draft modeling different from final? Particle tracking?
- How did Technical Guidance doc & settlement agreement constrain FEIS model?
- How was flow model calibrated? Match real conditions?
- Sensitivity analyses – what & why? Reduced uncertainty?
- What are the limitations of the model that was used in FEIS?
- Did FEIS model match up with characterization?

Page 1

EIS groundwater modeling (cont.)

- *[Overarching modeling questions]*
 - FEPS
 - How do you transfer lab rates to real sites?
 - How do you interpret a model (subjective)?
 - Parameters of a model – how do you determine? Future uses?
 - Degree of saturation, etc.?
 - Limitations of technologies being used to analyze site (e.g. high res. resistivity).
 - Rapid groundwater flow?

Page 2

EIS groundwater modeling (cont.)

- How did you pick the model?
 - Subquestions
- How will you use the results of FEIS model in the future? How will further analyses be done?
 - For PAs?
 - Site specifically?
 - Will it be changed?
 - RODs
 - Closure plans
 - Stability analysis
 - What models will be used for what decisions
 - (Unproductive aquifer areas?)

Page 3

EIS groundwater modeling (cont.)

1. What model, how calibrated?
2. Different from draft final
3. Future

Land Transition Between Programs & Contractors: Next Steps

- Q. Is there a mechanism for public comment? How/where should the HAB provide comment (advice)?
 - Track & address LTS related to F Reactor transition
 - Timeframe: April - completing SME recommendations for F Reactor

Land Transition Between Programs & Contractors (cont.)

- Part 1
 - Walkdown @ F Area
 - F Area punchlist, schedule
 - SME results
- Part 2
 - Final ROD development for F Area
 - End of 2013
 - (F Area transition may be in April/May)
- IM: Bob Suyama*, Jean Vanni, Dan Serres

Bin/ Follow-Up

- Switch March meeting dates? EIC discuss
- Who were 5 IMs who participated in the past groundwater workshops? (2006?) [Dale, Shelley, Jean]

River Corridor Overview/Progress: Next Steps

- Q: Grouting in ERDF? Jean follow up w/ Ecology
- Track in regards to RI/FSs & Proposed Plans

March (work planning)

- Tour? 200 West Pump & Treat
- 2015 Vision & beyond update
- Deep vadose zone remediation technologies
- Committee leadership

April (work planning)

- 300 Area Final Proposed Plan & RI/FS
- Land transition at F Area
- ROD F Area – What additional work identified between interim & final ROD at F Area
- Regulator briefing on their comments to the 100 F/IU operable unit 100 D/H OU & Proposed Plan Draft As
- EIS groundwater model – use/impacts to future work (more IM & DOE work needed)

May (work planning)

- ASCEM (PNNL) 3D modeling (not time critical, “filler”)
- 300 Area follow up? Advice?
- U Canyon – Update funding & mortgage cost (TBD)
- Orchard Lands OU Work Plan